



Noad, H., Spanton, E. M., Nowack, K. C., Inoue, H., Kim, M., Merz, T. A., Bell, C., Hikita, Y., Xu, R., Liu, W., Vailionis, A., Hwang, H. Y., & Moler, K. A. (2016). Variation in superconducting transition temperature due to tetragonal domains in two-dimensionally doped SrTiO_3 . *Physical Review B*, 94(17), [174516].
<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.94.174516>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1103/PhysRevB.94.174516](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.94.174516)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the accepted author manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via American Physical Society at DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevB.94.174516. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

Variation in Superconducting Transition Temperature due to Tetragonal Domains in Two-Dimensionally Doped SrTiO₃

Hilary Noad,^{1,2} Eric M. Spanton,^{1,3} Katja C. Nowack,² Hisashi Inoue,² Minu Kim,¹ Tyler A. Merz,^{1,2} Christopher Bell,^{1,4} Yasuyuki Hikita,¹ Ruqing Xu,⁵ Wenjun Liu,⁵ Arturas Vailionis,¹ Harold Y. Hwang,^{1,2} and Kathryn A. Moler^{1,2,3}

¹*Stanford Institute for Materials and Energy Sciences,*

SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory,

2575 Sand Hill Road, Menlo Park, CA 94025, USA

²*Department of Applied Physics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA*

³*Department of Physics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA*

⁴*HH Wills Physics Laboratory, University of Bristol,*

Tyndall Avenue, Bristol, BS8 1TL, UK

⁵*Advanced Photon Source, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, IL 60439, USA*

Abstract

Strontium titanate is a low-temperature, non-Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer superconductor that superconducts to carrier concentrations lower than in any other system and exhibits avoided ferroelectricity at low temperatures. Neither the mechanism of superconductivity in strontium titanate nor the importance of the structure and dielectric properties for the superconductivity are well understood. We studied the effects of twin structure on superconductivity in a 5.5-nm-thick layer of niobium-doped SrTiO₃ embedded in undoped SrTiO₃. We used a scanning superconducting quantum interference device susceptometer to image the local diamagnetic response of the sample as a function of temperature. We observed regions that exhibited a superconducting transition temperature $T_c \gtrsim 10\%$ higher than the temperature at which the sample was fully superconducting. The pattern of these regions varied spatially in a manner characteristic of structural twin domains. Some regions are too wide to originate on twin boundaries; therefore, we propose that the orientation of the tetragonal unit cell with respect to the doped plane affects T_c . Our results suggest that the anisotropic dielectric properties of SrTiO₃ are important for its superconductivity and need to be considered in any theory of the mechanism of the superconductivity.

Keywords: Condensed matter physics, Superconductivity, Materials Science

I. INTRODUCTION

Superconductivity in electron-doped SrTiO_3 (STO) most likely arises from electron-phonon coupling [1–10], yet it cannot be described by conventional Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer (BCS) theory [11] because the Fermi temperature in STO is lower than the Debye temperature, opposite to the requirement of BCS. Certain features of the superconductivity are reminiscent of unconventional, high-temperature superconductors: there is a dome-like dependence of transition temperature (T_c) on doping [1, 12–14] that is superficially similar to the domes found in the cuprates and iron pnictides [15, 16]. Further, STO superconductivity occurs close to a ferroelectric quantum critical point [8, 17, 18]; quantum criticality is important for superconductivity in the cuprates [15] and the iron pnictides [16]. Superconductivity in STO is a puzzle in and of itself, and is also important in the context of understanding superconductivity in thin-film and interfacial systems that are grown on STO. Furthering our understanding of STO superconductivity may shed light on the role of STO in the reported pseudogap behavior of LaAlO_3 (LAO)/STO heterostructures [19, 20]. It may also illuminate the contribution of STO phonons and the importance of the dielectric properties of STO to monolayer FeSe on STO [21–23].

A cubic-to-tetragonal structural phase transition occurs in STO at 105 K: small rotations of the TiO_6 octahedra cause the unit cell to double in height and the in-plane axes to rotate by 45° and lengthen by a factor of $\sqrt{2}$ [24]. We will refer to the tetragonal unit cell using the pseudocubic convention ($a = a_{tet}/\sqrt{2}$ and is oriented parallel to cubic $\langle 100 \rangle$; $c = c_{tet}/2$). The tetragonal crystal phase allows three orientations of crystallographic twin domains to form. The twins are distinguished by whether the tetragonal c axis points along the former cubic $[100]$, $[010]$, or $[001]$ axis. The twin structure strongly influences local normal-state electronic properties [25, 26] and weakly modulates the superfluid density at temperatures well below T_c in LAO/STO heterostructures [25]. By studying the effects of the perturbation due to twin structure on superconducting δ -doped STO, we hope to expand our understanding of the origin of superconductivity in STO.

Here, we studied the effects of twin structure on superconductivity in δ -doped STO [27–30]. Using a scanning superconducting quantum interference device (SQUID) susceptometer, we observed a local variation in T_c that was set by the tetragonal twin structure of the material. The orientation and range of widths of the features of enhanced T_c suggest that many

of those features occur within domains, as opposed to at twin boundaries. We propose that the underlying mechanism of the variation in T_c is related to modulations of the dielectric environment that are driven by the orientation of the lattice relative to the superconducting plane, and by generic alterations of the dielectric environment near twin boundaries.

II. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

We used a SQUID susceptometer in a dilution refrigerator with a base temperature below 50 mK (during scanning) [31, 32] to study superconductivity in δ -doped STO [27–30]. The SQUID susceptometer consists of a gradiometric SQUID whose pickup loops ($\approx 3 \mu\text{m}$ in diameter) are arranged concentrically with single-turn field coils ($\approx 20 \mu\text{m}$ in diameter). We measured the response of the sample using the primary pickup loop-field coil pair, while the counterwound rear pickup loop canceled the response of the SQUID to the applied field [32].

We rastered the SQUID over the sample in a plane parallel to the δ -doped layer in the STO and spatially mapped the diamagnetic response of the superconductor to the magnetic field that we applied with the field coil. In the sensor geometry that we used for our measurements, the diamagnetic response of the two-dimensional superconductor is directly proportional to the superfluid density (Appendix A) [33, 34]. We observed the critical temperature locally by determining when the diamagnetism disappeared (when the measured susceptibility matched a background measurement).

We studied two samples of δ -doped STO as well as a single-crystal sample of bulk Nb-doped STO (dopant concentration $N_D = 1 \text{ at.}\%$) that was obtained from Shinkosha, Inc. The δ -doped samples were fabricated using pulsed laser deposition, with the growth conditions described elsewhere [35]. The structures consist of a thin layer (thickness d) doped with Nb that is embedded between undoped STO cap and buffer layers [28, 35] and exhibits two-dimensional superconductivity [27]. The electrons are confined around the doped layer by the Coulomb potential from the dopant ions.

This investigation focused on the results from a thinner and higher density δ -doped sample ($d = 5.5 \text{ nm}$, $N_D = 1 \text{ at.}\%$ Nb), but we also measured a thicker and lower density δ -doped sample ($d = 36.9 \text{ nm}$, $N_D = 0.2 \text{ at.}\%$ Nb). We measured the 1 at.% Nb δ -doped sample in two separate cooldowns, the second one occurring after having warmed the sample to room temperature, removed it to a desiccator from its sample holder, and stored it for several

months.

The total area of the $d = 5.5$ nm, $N_D = 1$ at.% Nb sample was approximately 7.7 mm^2 . In the first cooldown, we imaged $\approx 30\%$ of the total area at a temperature close to but generally below the upper T_c [36]. Imaging in this temperature range allowed us to identify areas of interest for studying the temperature dependence of the susceptibility while efficiently exploring the sample over millimeter length scales. The total area over which we imaged the temperature dependence of the susceptibility was $\approx 2.8 \times 10^5 \text{ } \mu\text{m}^2$ in the first cooldown and $\approx 1.6 \times 10^5 \text{ } \mu\text{m}^2$ in the second, or approximately 4% and 2% of the total sample area, respectively.

We performed differential aperture X-ray microdiffraction [37–39] experiments at beamline 34-ID-E at the Advanced Photon Source, Argonne National Laboratory [40] on the 1 at.% Nb δ -doped STO. This beamline is equipped with a liquid nitrogen-cooled stage that we used to cool the STO below its structural transition temperature of 105 K [24]. We collected Laue diffraction patterns while rastering the sample under the X-ray beam, then indexed each pattern to a distorted room temperature cubic unit cell for STO [37–39] in order to determine the orientation of the local crystal structure (extended discussion in Appendix B).

III. RESULTS

To determine the spatial dependence of T_c , we mapped the susceptibility as a function of temperature near T_c in several regions of the 1 at.% Nb δ -doped STO sample [Fig. 1(a)-(c)]. Some parts of the scanned areas were diamagnetic, indicating that their T_c was higher than the scan temperature. In contrast, surrounding parts had zero or very weakly positive (paramagnetic) susceptibility, indicating that they were not superconducting and that their T_c was lower than or equal to the scan temperature. We observed similar regions of locally elevated T_c in the 0.2 at.% Nb δ -doped STO sample (Appendix C).

The patterns we observed in susceptibility images [e.g. Fig. 1, Fig. 2(b), Fig. 3(a)-(b), Fig. 4(a)] are consistent with enhanced T_c on twin boundaries or with T_c being higher on certain tetragonal domains of δ -doped STO than on others. We detected regions of locally higher T_c aligned along axes that corresponded to the high-temperature cubic $\langle 100 \rangle$ directions, as determined via comparison to SQUID images that included an oriented edge of the sample. The spacing, splitting, and comb-like structures resemble patterns in images of

tetragonal domains in STO taken with a polarized light microscope at higher temperatures [25, 26, 41, 42].

Some well-defined features, such as the diagonal mark in the middle-left of Fig. 1(a), were evident along other directions. Those features did not exhibit a higher T_c than their surroundings, and we believe that they may be due to damage to the sample. In addition, along the edge of an area that was masked by a clip during growth, we observed diffuse regions that had a higher T_c overall, compared to adjacent featureless regions of the superconductor [masked area is in the lower right of Fig. 2(a)]. The general enhancement of T_c in the diffuse regions could be due to differences in growth conditions, strain relaxation, or other unknown effects along the edge of the masked region.

In the first cooldown of the $N_D = 1$ at.% Nb δ -doped sample, we imaged $\approx 30\%$ of the total sample area at an intermediate temperature and observed $\langle 100 \rangle$ -oriented features having T_c higher than their surroundings in $\approx 50\%$ of the area surveyed [36]. Although features of elevated T_c were not rare in that particular cooldown, factors such as the cooling rate, unintentional strain from sample mounting, or the geometry of the sample [43] could alter the shape, number, and orientation of tetragonal domains that spontaneously form upon cooling through 105 K [24].

The configuration of SrTiO₃ tetragonal domains was previously shown to change on thermal cycling [25]. To test whether the patterns in T_c also behaved in this manner, we measured the same 1 at.% Nb δ -doped sample after thermal cycling it above the structural transition at 105 K. We used a region that had been masked by a clip during pulsed laser deposition growth to identify specific positions before and after warming. Before warming, we detected diffuse regions of higher T_c close to the clipped region, with no sharply defined rectangular features elsewhere [Fig. 2(a)]. We observed similar diffuse regions of higher T_c along the edges of all areas of the clipped region that we imaged in the first cooldown. After thermal cycling, we obtained a qualitatively different susceptibility image at the same location and temperature [Fig. 2(b)]: the image obtained after warming contained sharp rectangular regions similar to those depicted in Fig. 1. The observation that well-defined, $\langle 100 \rangle$ -oriented features appeared in this area after warming above the structural transition [Fig. 2(b)] strongly suggests that such features originate in the tetragonal domain structure of STO.

To confirm the shape and orientation of structural domains in the 1 at.% Nb δ -doped

STO, we used differential aperture X-ray microdiffraction to obtain real space maps of tilts in the c axis above and below the structural phase transition (Appendix B). The spatial resolution of the X-ray microdiffraction measurements ($\approx 5 \mu\text{m}$) was similar to the limit on the scanning SQUID measurements set by the diameter of the pickup loop ($\approx 3 \mu\text{m}$). Below the transition, long, narrow features were evident (Fig. 5), with the orientations expected for structural domains. Their widths, on the order of tens of microns, were comparable to the features detected via scanning SQUID (e.g. Figs. 1, 2, 3, 4 and Appendix D). Depth-resolved microdiffraction measurements of the same δ -doped STO [40] show tetragonal domains extending from the bulk of the undoped substrate to the surface of the sample. The spatial resolution along the depth direction ($\approx 1 \mu\text{m}$) was not sufficient to resolve the heterostructure ($\approx 0.2 \mu\text{m}$ thick) from the bulk substrate. To within the depth and lateral spatial resolution of the experiment, there was no evidence of near-surface alterations in the structure of the STO [40], suggesting that domains from the substrate extend into the heterostructure.

To discern whether the variation in T_c occurs on twin boundaries or within certain tetragonal domains of the δ -doped STO, we now consider the widths and orientations in more detail. We observed considerable variation in the widths of the regions of locally higher T_c (Fig. 7; extended discussion in Appendix D). Notably, features ranged from a width that was apparently resolution limited [e.g. Fig. 1(b)] to a full width at half maximum that was wider than the diameter of the field coil on our SQUID ($\approx 20 \mu\text{m}$), [e.g. Fig. 3(c)]. The lower limit on the spatial resolution of our SQUID is set by the diameter of the pickup loop ($\approx 3 \mu\text{m}$). This variation of widths is consistent with the sizes of domains observed via polarized light microscopy [25, 26, 41, 42]. In contrast, domain boundaries are predicted to have widths on the order of a few unit cells [44]. Features caused by boundaries would have widths limited by the superconducting coherence length, $\approx 100 \text{ nm}$ [30], well below our spatial resolution. Thus, many of the features detected here are likely not produced by domain boundaries in the STO sample, but rather are suggestive of domains with higher T_c .

The orientations of the regions of locally elevated T_c also help us to distinguish between features occurring at domain boundaries or within certain domains. The intersection of domain boundaries with the (001) superconducting plane can be oriented along [100], [010], or at $\sim 45^\circ$ to [100] (Fig. 8). Boundaries that are at $\sim 45^\circ$ to [100] only occur between domains that both have the c axis in-plane, whereas the [100] and [010] boundaries occur

between a domain with c in-plane and a domain with c out-of-plane. If domains with c axis out-of-plane have a different T_c from ones with c in-plane, we would expect to see rectangles of locally higher (or lower) T_c whose borders were oriented along $[100]$ and $[010]$ but not at $\sim 45^\circ$ to $[100]$ (Fig. 8), and this matches what we observe.

We overwhelmingly observed regions of locally elevated T_c that were oriented along former cubic $[100]$ and $[010]$ axes. This observation, together with the width of some features, strongly suggests that the variation in T_c that we observe is within individual domains, instead of at their boundaries. It is possible that twin boundaries could produce a similar signature: sample geometry [43] or unintentional strain could favor twin boundary orientations ($[100]$ or $[010]$) that would not be distinguished from narrow in-domain features. We detected a single region of elevated T_c at approximately -45° from $[100]$ (Fig. 9). The -45° feature suggests that twin boundaries may lead to an enhancement in T_c in some circumstances. While only boundaries can yield $\sim 45^\circ$ features, the range of widths in the $[100]$ - and $[010]$ -oriented features suggests that many of them originate within certain domains.

To investigate the relationship between local T_c and low-temperature superfluid density, we measured the temperature dependence of the susceptibility in a series of images (Fig. 3). In the region shown in Fig. 3(a), parts of the scanned area were no longer superconducting at $T_{c,\text{low}} \approx 320$ mK, while oriented regions remained superconducting until $T_{c,\text{high}} \approx 370$ mK. Using the relation $\Delta T_c/T_c = 100\% \times (T_{c,\text{high}} - T_{c,\text{low}})/T_{c,\text{low}}$, we determined that $\Delta T_c/T_c \approx 16\%$ for the area in Fig. 3(a), and $\Delta T_c/T_c \approx 9\%$ for the area in Fig. 3(b). Similar estimates for the regions displayed in Fig. 1, Fig. 2(b), and Fig. 4 are presented in Appendix E, Table I. Linecuts taken near T_c and at temperatures well below T_c [Fig. 3(c) and (d)] demonstrate that although there was large spatial variation in the susceptibility near T_c , the variation fell to $\approx 5\%$ of the average signal at 100 mK [Fig. 3(b)]. Further, there was little to no modulation of the susceptibility ($\lesssim 2\%$) at the lowest temperatures measured [Fig. 3(a)].

Tetragonal domains in STO can cause variations in height at the surface of the STO or STO-based heterostructures (e.g. [26]), but the spatial variation in susceptibility that we observed is too large to be explained by height variation across domains. For a ≈ 40 μm -wide domain [Fig. 3(b,d), Fig. 7(d,e)] with surface tilted $\approx 1/2000$ radians to the cubic (001) surface plane [26], we expect the height to change by ≈ 20 nm across its width. This change in height should produce at most a 0.4% variation in susceptibility at 100 mK, much smaller than the $\approx 5\%$ variation that we observe [Fig. 3(b) upper left image, Fig. 3(d)]. At

temperatures close to T_c , for example, at 330 mK, the same change in height would produce a 0.08% variation in susceptibility signal, orders of magnitude smaller than the variation that we observe [Fig. 3(b,d)].

The temperature dependence of the superfluid density can give insight into the nature of the superconducting order parameter. The superconductivity of the δ -doped samples that we measured was in a limit where the superfluid density is directly proportional to the susceptibility that we measured with our SQUID [33, 34]. Therefore, to track the temperature dependence of the superfluid density in our samples, we extracted susceptibility versus temperature curves at two different locations from images of the same area at different temperatures (Fig. 4). At the lowest temperatures, the susceptibility begins to flatten [Fig. 4(b)], consistent with *s*-wave behavior and inconsistent with a nodal gap, which would yield superfluid density related to temperature in a linear to quadratic fashion depending on scattering [45]. Note that the direct proportionality between susceptibility and superfluid density [33, 34] is only strictly valid for an infinite sheet geometry, so we cannot draw detailed conclusions from the high temperature functional form of these data. The apparent shoulder in the higher- T_c region in Fig. 4(b) (red triangles) is most likely due to the geometry of the diamagnetic source changing from a quasi-uniform, infinite plane at low temperatures to a series of separated, narrow strips near T_c .

The two-dimensionality of the δ -doped material may mean that subbands, which are irrelevant in the three-dimensional material, are important for determining T_c or other aspects of the superconductivity. We investigated the importance of subband occupation by measuring a δ -doped STO sample that contained 36.9 nm of 0.2 at.% Nb (Fig. 6) and comparing it to the δ -doped STO that had 5.5 nm of 1 at.% Nb (e.g. Fig. 1). The overall temperature scale for superconductivity in the 0.2 at.% Nb δ -doped sample was lower than that in the 1 at.% Nb δ -doped sample, consistent with transport measurements of T_c (Fig. 10 inset). We detected patterns of modulated T_c in the 0.2 at.% Nb δ -doped sample (Fig. 6) that were qualitatively similar to those in the 1 at.% Nb δ -doped sample (e.g. Fig. 1). Thus, the local variation of T_c does not require a specific occupation or configuration of subbands in order to occur.

IV. DISCUSSION

Various parameters are tuned by the crystal domain structure of the STO, including the direction of the elongated c axis, the local strain [40, 46], and the dielectric constant [47]. By comparing the relative variation of these parameters to the observed variation in T_c , we sought to identify the most important parameters. Here, $\Delta T_c/T_c$ was on the order of 10^{-1} , where T_c is the temperature at which the whole scan area is superconducting. Given the widths of the features observed (Appendix D), here we will mainly focus on how physical parameters are tuned within the structural domains themselves, as opposed to on boundaries.

One possibility is that T_c is tuned by strain within structural domains. The change in the lattice constant along the lengthened pseudocubic c axis, $|c-a|/a$, is on the order of 10^{-3} [46]. The theoretical relationship between T_c and $|c-a|/a$ is not well known; however, we note that the relative change in lattice constant due to the structural transition is much smaller than the relative change in T_c detected here. Further, we would expect strain due to the tetragonal mismatch, and the associated change in T_c , to be largest at domain boundaries, inconsistent with the majority of our observations. Each domain may have built-in strain due to the neighboring domain configuration or other factors, but we do not expect this strain to greatly exceed the lattice constant change ($|c-a|/a$) [40] or to be uniform over many-micron length scales, as would be required to produce the relatively broad features observed [e.g. Fig. 3(b)].

Another possibility is that T_c is tuned by variations in the dielectric constant related to the orientation of the crystal relative to the superconducting plane. In undoped, single-domain STO in the tetragonal phase, the value of the static dielectric constant ε is enormous at 4 K, on the order of 10^4 , and depends on the orientation along which it is measured [47]. The value along the a axis, $\varepsilon_a \approx 25\,000$, is over twice as large as the value along the c axis, $\varepsilon_c \approx 11\,000$ [47]. For δ -doped STO, the anisotropy in the dielectric constant implies that the local dielectric constant perpendicular to the two-dimensional superconducting plane depends on the direction of the c axis within the structural domain. Because the change in dielectric constant is large while the change in pseudocubic axes is small, we hypothesize that the change in T_c that we observed may be driven primarily by the dielectric properties of the crystal, either directly or through the associated phonon modes.

The dielectric constant in STO decreases with increasing applied electric field [48]. In δ -doped STO, the dielectric constant in the vicinity of the doped layer is reduced by the electric field of the ionized Nb donors. Ref. [49] presents self-consistent calculations of the dielectric constant for a δ -doped sample with $d = 5.5$ nm, $N_D = 1$ at.% Nb (the parameters for the main sample studied here). Assuming $\varepsilon = 2.6 \times 10^4$ before doping, ε reaches a minimum of approximately 5×10^2 at the edge of the doped layer. By 25 nm from the center of the doped layer, well within the 100 nm-thick cap layer, ε returns to its original order of magnitude [49]. To date, self-consistent calculations for δ -doped STO have not included the orientation dependence of ε . However, as long as a relative difference between ε_a and ε_c is preserved throughout the heterostructure, tetragonal domain structure should still spatially vary the dielectric constant experienced by the two-dimensional electron system as discussed above.

Variations or modifications of the dielectric constant within the superconducting plane could alter T_c through screening of the Coulomb repulsion. For example, electrons in a domain where the c axis lies in-plane (a - c domains) experience a dielectric constant that is the average of ε_a and ε_c , whereas electrons in a domain where the c axis points out-of-plane (a - a domains) experience primarily ε_a . Since ε_a is larger than the average of ε_a and ε_c , the Coulomb repulsion between electrons in a - a domains should be more strongly screened than in a - c domains. With stronger screening could come stronger pairing and higher T_c in a - a domains.

Variations in screening of the Coulomb interaction may also have implications for the confinement of electrons in the δ -doped layer. In δ -doped STO, the Coulomb potential set up by the ionized dopant cores confines the mobile electrons to a narrow, electronically two-dimensional layer [27, 28]. Local variations in the dielectric constant, both within the doped layer and in its vicinity, should alter the spatial extent of the electrons in the direction perpendicular to the dopant layer. Tuning of the fraction of electrons that dwelled outside the doped layer could tune scattering or two-dimensional electron density in a pattern set by twin structure.

In a BCS s -wave superconductor, non-magnetic scattering would change the low-temperature superfluid density but not T_c [50], implying that local changes in conductivity or carrier concentration that were due to disorder would not affect T_c . However, the independence of T_c and disorder depends on a theorem that is not valid for superconductors having a non-retarded pairing interaction (Fermi energy smaller than the phonon cutoff frequency)

[51]. STO is in or close to the non-retarded limit [13]; thus, it is possible that variations in scattering, carrier density, or defects could tune T_c . We note that in bulk-doped STO, $N_D = 1$ at.% Nb corresponds essentially to the peak of the dome in T_c [1, 12–14]. Neglecting disorder effects, this suggests that in our δ -doped sample with $N_D = 1$ at.% Nb, changes in carrier density in either direction would cause T_c to decrease, not increase.

Structurally driven anisotropy in the Fermi surface could potentially alter T_c . First-principles calculations of the Fermi surface in *bulk* electron-doped STO showed that the tetragonal anisotropy produces a considerable distortion in the Fermi surface, compressing it along the c direction by as much as 35% [52]. In our δ -doped material, the Fermi surface is dramatically altered from the bulk by confinement in the vertical direction [29], yet despite the change in dimensionality, the overall scale of T_c in our $N_D = 1$ at.% Nb δ -doped material is within the range of peak T_c s observed for material doped in the bulk [1, 12–14]. It is likely that structural anisotropy within the conducting plane, i.e. the orientation of the c axis relative to the plane, causes additional anisotropy in the Fermi surface. However, the relative insensitivity of T_c to the large overall change in Fermi surface suggests that smaller, structurally driven changes in the Fermi surface are not the dominant source of our observed variation in T_c .

Until now, we have focused on ways in which structure could modify T_c within domains rather than at boundaries. Much of our discussion considered the hypothesis that T_c is tuned by variation in the dielectric constant. For the case of domains, we proposed that the variation in dielectric constant came from intrinsic structural anisotropy: whether the c axis of a domain, with its considerably smaller dielectric constant, was parallel or perpendicular to the superconducting plane. Twin boundaries may be a second source of variation in the dielectric constant. Recent observations of polar domain walls in bulk STO [53, 54], together with previous observations of twin-modified current flow and surface potential in LAO/STO heterostructures [25, 26], strongly suggest that twin boundaries modify their local dielectric environment. This alteration could lead to variations in T_c that would be at domain boundaries rather than within certain domains.

Our results are relevant to understanding both bulk electron-doped STO and two-dimensional electron systems in STO-based heterostructures. δ -doped STO is representative of heterostructures in the reduced dimensionality of its electron system and in that it has been grown via a method similar to that used to grow heterostructures [55]. At the

same time, the δ -doped STO system simply consists of STO that has been doped with Nb, albeit in an unusual geometry that allows us to access effects related to the structural and dielectric anisotropy that would otherwise be difficult to observe. Effects occurring *within* domains would be much less evident in bulk STO because there would be no special in- or out-of-plane direction that would distinguish certain domains from others, apart from near the surface of the crystal. Domain boundaries could produce some effect on the superconductivity in bulk STO, but the effect would likely be subtle compared to the strong diamagnetic screening of the bulk material.

Lin and coworkers [56] recently suggested that there may be enhanced T_c at twin boundaries in bulk-doped STO due to the observation that, over a wide range of dopings, the transition to zero resistance occurs at a temperature where the bulk electrons are still normal. We believe that the regions of locally higher T_c that we observed in δ -doped STO are primarily located within certain domains, rather than at boundaries. In the bulk STO that we investigated here (Appendix G), we did not observe sharply defined diamagnetic features surrounded by weak paramagnetism near T_c as we observed in the δ -doped STO [e.g. Fig. 1, Fig. 2(b), Fig. 3(a)-(b), Fig. 4(a)]. However, we did observe faint rectangular features of higher diamagnetic response surrounded by comparatively weaker diamagnetism near, but fully below, T_c of the scanned area [Fig. 11(a)]. These features may be near-surface features occurring within certain domains, or they may be due to twin boundaries.

Enhanced T_c on domain boundaries in other systems has been inferred from bulk measurements of niobium and tin, both of which are described by standard BCS theory [57]. Proposed mechanisms for the enhancement in T_c included softening of the phonon spectrum or enhanced electron-phonon coupling (due to atoms being further apart and Coulomb repulsion diminished) at the boundaries [57]. Although STO superconductivity differs from that in tin and niobium in the details, it is possible that similar mechanisms for enhancing T_c could be at play. Twin-boundary-driven enhancements in superconductivity are not limited to conventional electron-phonon superconductors. For example, enhanced superfluid density was observed at twin boundaries in underdoped $\text{Ba}(\text{Fe},\text{Co})_2\text{As}_2$ [58]; however, enhanced T_c was not. The mechanism for the enhancement in superfluid density was not known at the time of the previous report.

Published theories of superconductivity in STO [1–9] or STO-based heterostructures [10, 23, 59] that make reference to microscopic mechanisms all consider an electron-phonon

pairing mechanism but differ in their treatment of the electron-phonon interaction. Some consider either soft transverse optical ferroelectric phonons [5, 8] or high-energy polar longitudinal optical modes [6, 9, 10, 23] to be important, while others consider non-ferroelectric optical modes [1, 2, 4], acoustic modes [3], or a combination of contributions from acoustic and optical modes [7, 59]. Plasmon-mediated electron pairing was additionally considered in the low-density regime [5]. Our results suggest that twin structure modulates T_c by modulating the local dielectric environment. Discriminating between theories of superconductivity in STO will require a microscopic understanding of the consequences of structurally driven local variations in the dielectric properties of STO.

V. CONCLUSION

We have shown that tetragonal domain structure locally modulates the superconducting transition temperature in regions of two-dimensionally doped STO. While it is not surprising that changes in the crystal lattice affect T_c , our observation that T_c varies by $\gtrsim 10\%$ while the lattice constants change by only 0.1% is notable, and suggests that the dielectric properties of STO play an important role in this material's superconductivity.

The modulation in T_c that we detected in two-dimensionally doped STO is likely relevant in systems in which superconductivity arises due to interface effects between STO and another material, such as LAO/STO [55, 60] and monolayer FeSe grown on STO [21–23, 61]. Our results further motivate the development of microscopic modeling of STO that takes structure as well as local dielectric properties into account.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank John Berlinsky, Robert Laughlin, Steven Kivelson, Srinivas Raghu, and Akash Maharaj for helpful discussions and Christopher Watson for feedback on our manuscript. This work was supported by the Department of Energy, Office of Science, Basic Energy Sciences, Materials Sciences and Engineering Division, under Contract DE-AC02-76SF00515. Differential aperture X-ray microdiffraction was carried out at the Advanced Photon Source, a DOE Office of Science User Facility operated for the DOE Office of Science by Argonne National Laboratory under Contract No. DE-AC02-06CH11357. H. N. acknowledges sup-

port from a Stanford Graduate Fellowship and a Natural Sciences and Engineering Council of Canada PGS D. T.A.M. also acknowledges support from the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship under Grant No. DGE-114747.

Appendix A: Connection between susceptibility and superfluid density

We report susceptibility in units of superconducting flux quanta per ampere of current passing through the field coil, Φ_0/A , where $\Phi_0 = h/(2e)$, h is Planck's constant, and e is the electron charge.

Under certain conditions, the susceptibility signal measured with our scanning SQUID is directly proportional to the superfluid density, n_s . The superconductor must be in the Pearl limit, with the superconducting thickness, d_{sc} , much smaller than the penetration depth, λ [62]. Additionally, the field coil diameter and the distance between the SQUID and the superconductor must be much larger than d_{sc} [33]. If these conditions are satisfied, then the susceptibility signal at constant height is inversely proportional to the Pearl length, $\Lambda = 2\lambda^2/d_{sc}$, and is proportional to the superfluid density $n_s = 2m^*/\mu_0 e^2 \Lambda$, where m^* is the effective mass [33, 34].

Our measurements at temperatures below the emergence of separated domains of diamagnetism were in this limit: the thickness of the Nb-doped layer in the δ -doped STO was 5.5 nm for the data discussed in the main text (Fig. 1, Fig. 2, Fig. 3, Fig. 4) (36.9 nm in Appendix C). The superconducting thickness in the δ -doped STO, estimated from the temperature dependence of the upper critical field, was somewhat larger than the thickness of the doped layer (for example, in the $d = 5.5$ nm sample, the estimated thickness of the superconductivity was 8.4 nm [27]) but still within the same limit. The Pearl length estimated from fits to Pearl vortices (not shown) was on the order of 600-800 μm , much larger than the thickness of the superconductivity. The field coil diameter was ≈ 20 μm , and the distance from the SQUID to the sample was 1-2 μm .

Appendix B: X-ray microdiffraction

We performed differential aperture X-ray microdiffraction [37–39] experiments at beamline 34-ID-E at the Advanced Photon Source, Argonne National Laboratory [40] on the 1

at.% Nb δ -doped STO. This beamline is equipped with a liquid nitrogen-cooled stage that we used to cool the STO below its structural transition temperature of 105 K [24]. We collected Laue diffraction patterns while rastering the sample under the X-ray beam (beam width $\approx 1\ \mu\text{m}$, planar step size $\approx 5\ \mu\text{m}$). We indexed each pattern to a room temperature cubic unit cell for STO [37–39] and then performed deviatoric strain refinements to determine the orientation of the lattice distortion at low temperature.

To create a spatial map of tilts of the unit cell, we expressed the orientation of the unit cell in terms of vectors in a three-dimensional, rectangular space. Since the primitive lattice vectors are orthogonal to one another in a cubic or tetragonal unit cell, the orientation of any one of these vectors relative to a fixed coordinate system uniquely describes the orientation of the entire unit cell, thus encoding tilting of the unit cell.

In the images in Fig. 5, we represent changes in the orientation of the lattice by encoding the (x,y,z) components of the c^* reciprocal lattice vector in red, green, and blue, respectively. At room temperature, above the cubic-to-tetragonal structural phase transition temperature, the lattice orientation changes smoothly and by very little over hundreds of microns [Fig. 5(a)]. In contrast, at 80 K, below the cubic-to-tetragonal transition, there are abrupt changes in tilt whose orientations and sizes are consistent with tetragonal domains [Fig. 5(b)].

Appendix C: Similar features in another δ -doped sample

We measured a second δ -doped sample with $d = 36.9\ \text{nm}$, $N_D = 0.2\ \text{at.}\%$ Nb. We detected long, narrow regions of diamagnetism surrounded by paramagnetism (Fig. 6), similar to our observations in the $d = 5.5\ \text{nm}$, $N_D = 1\ \text{at.}\%$ Nb sample (Fig. 1 of the main text). The temperature scale for superconductivity in the 0.2 at.% sample was lower than for the 1 at.% sample, consistent with global resistance measurements (inset to Fig. 10) made in a separate cooldown on the two samples.

Appendix D: Widths of the stripes

An upper bound on the spatial resolution of our susceptibility measurements would be set by the length scale of variations in the field that we apply to the sample (by the di-

ameter of the field coil, which was $\approx 20 \mu\text{m}$ in the present investigation). This scenario would be relevant, for example, in the case of a three-dimensional superconductor with a penetration depth much smaller than our sensor size and with a correspondingly strong diamagnetic response. The system that we studied was in a very different limit; we studied a two-dimensional superconductor near T_c in which the diamagnetic response was weak, with the response field produced by the sample being a factor of 10^3 smaller than the maximum applied field. In this limit, we expect the spatial resolution of our susceptibility measurements to be smaller than the length scale of the field coil. A lower bound on the resolution of our susceptibility images is set by the diameter of the pickup loop ($\approx 3 \mu\text{m}$) and the distance between our sensor and the sample [63].

If the underlying source of the features that we observed were narrower than our spatial resolution, e.g. domain boundaries or very narrow domains, then we would expect to see many features of the same apparent width in our images. On the other hand, if the underlying source were sometimes wider than our spatial resolution, then we would expect to see a range of widths in our susceptibility images. We observe a variety of widths, many of which were wider than our pickup loop, and a few of which were even wider than the diameter of our field coil (Fig. 7).

Appendix E: Lower and upper T_c

We calculated the percent variation in T_c according to $\Delta T_c/T_c = 100\% \times (T_{c,\text{high}} - T_{c,\text{low}})/T_{c,\text{low}}$. For the purposes of these estimates, we defined T_c conservatively. For example, if a scan at 370 mK still showed regions of diamagnetism but 380 mK did not, we took $T_{c,\text{high}} = 370$ mK. For $T_{c,\text{low}}$, if a featureless area contained some patchy normal regions at 310 mK but was not fully normal until 320 mK, we assigned $T_{c,\text{low}} = 320$ mK [Fig. 3(a)]. In Table I, we summarize values of $T_{c,\text{low}}$, $T_{c,\text{high}}$, and $\Delta T_c/T_c$ for the regions displayed in Fig. 1(a-c), Fig. 2(b), Fig. 3(a-b), and Fig. 4(a) of the main text. In Fig. 10, we compare the transition temperatures determined from susceptibility scans that are tabulated in Table I to a global measurement of resistance vs. temperature made on the same sample in a separate cooldown.

With the exception of the images presented in Fig. 6, the temperatures reported for the scanning SQUID measurements were measured at the mixing chamber of our dilution fridge.

In an earlier cooldown, we recorded the temperature at our scanner cage using a ruthenium oxide thermometer in a copper bobbin that was rigidly mounted to the oxygen-free, high-conductivity copper cage. Above 100 mK, we found that the mixing chamber temperature was a reasonable proxy for the cage temperature to approximately ± 10 mK. Temperatures reported in Fig. 6 were measured with the ruthenium oxide thermometer.

Appendix F: Location of enhancement of T_c

In the first cooldown, we imaged the temperature dependence of the susceptibility in ten regions, corresponding to approximately 4% of the total sample area, and found only one feature oriented at $(-)\text{45}^\circ$ to cubic [100] [probably corresponding to the case illustrated in Fig. 8(c)] whose T_c was clearly enhanced relative to its surroundings (Fig. 9). In the second cooldown, we imaged the temperature dependence of the susceptibility in six regions, corresponding to approximately 2% of the total sample area, and did not find any features of enhanced T_c at $(-)\text{45}^\circ$ to cubic [100].

Appendix G: Bulk doped STO

To check whether single-crystal, bulk-doped STO exhibited similar variations in T_c as in the δ -doped STO, we mapped susceptibility as a function of temperature in a single-crystal sample of 1 at.% Nb-doped STO. We observed faint rectangular features of stronger diamagnetic response surrounded by comparatively weaker diamagnetism near, but fully below, T_c [Fig. 11(a)]. These features did not persist above the T_c of their surroundings (to within our temperature step size of 10 mK) [Fig. 11(b)].

-
- [1] C. S. Koonce, M. L. Cohen, J. F. Schooley, W. R. Hosler, and E. R. Pfeiffer, “Superconducting transition temperatures of semiconducting SrTiO_3 ,” *Phys. Rev.* **163**, 380 (1967).
 - [2] J. Appel, “Soft-mode superconductivity in SrTiO_{3-x} ,” *Phys. Rev.* **180**, 508 (1969).
 - [3] Z. Zinamon, “Superconductivity by small polarons,” *Philos. Mag.* **21**, 347 (1970).
 - [4] K. L. Ngai, “Two-phonon deformation potential and superconductivity in degenerate semiconductors,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **32**, 215 (1974).

- [5] Y. Takada, “Theory of superconductivity in polar semiconductors and its application to N-type semiconducting SrTiO_3 ,” J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **49**, 1267 (1980).
- [6] Alexis Baratoff and Gerd Binnig, “Mechanism of superconductivity in SrTiO_3 ,” Physica B+C **108**, 1335–1336 (1981).
- [7] S. N. Klimin, J. Tempere, D. van der Marel, and J. T. Devreese, “Microscopic mechanisms for the fermi-liquid behavior of Nb-doped strontium titanate,” Phys. Rev. B **86**, 045113 (2012).
- [8] Jonathan M. Edge, Yaron Kedem, Ulrich Aschauer, Nicola A. Spaldin, and Alexander V. Balatsky, “Quantum critical origin of the superconducting dome in SrTiO_3 ,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 247002 (2015).
- [9] Lev P. Gor’kov, “Phonon mechanism in the most dilute superconductor n -type SrTiO_3 ,” Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **113**, 4646 (2016).
- [10] Baruch Rosenstein, B. Ya. Shapiro, I. Shapiro, and Dingping Li, “Superconductivity in 2D electron gas induced by high energy optical phonon mode and large polarization of the STO substrate,” (2016), arXiv:1601.07425v1 [cond-mat].
- [11] J. Bardeen, L. N. Cooper, and J. R. Schrieffer, “Theory of superconductivity,” Phys. Rev. **180**, 1175 (1957).
- [12] J. F. Schooley, W. R. Hosler, E. Ambler, J.H. Becker, M. L. Cohen, and C. S. Koonce, “Dependence of the superconducting transition temperature on carrier concentration in semiconducting SrTiO_3 ,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **14**, 305 (1965).
- [13] X. Lin, Z. Zhu, B. Fauqué, and K. Behnia, “Fermi surface of the most dilute superconductor,” Phys. Rev. X **3**, 021002 (2013).
- [14] X. Lin, G. Bridoux, A. Gourgout, G. Seyfarth, S. Krämer, M. Nardone, B. Fauqué, and K. Behnia, “Critical doping for the onset of a two-band superconducting ground state in $\text{SrTiO}_{3-\delta}$,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 207002 (2014).
- [15] D. M. Broun, “What lies beneath the dome?” Nat. Phys. **4**, 170 (2008).
- [16] T. Shibauchi, A. Carrington, and Y. Matsuda, “A quantum critical point lying beneath the superconducting dome in iron pnictides,” Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys. **5**, 113 (2014).
- [17] K. A. Müller and H. Burkard, “ SrTiO_3 : An intrinsic quantum paraelectric below 4 K,” Phys. Rev. B **19**, 3593 (1979).
- [18] S. E. Rowley, L. J. Spalek, R. P. Smith, M. P. M. Dean, M. Itoh, J. F. Scott, G. G. Lonzarich, and S. S. Saxena, “Ferroelectric quantum criticality,” Nat. Phys. **10**, 367 (2014).

- [19] C. Richter, H. Boschker, W. Dietsche, E. Fillis-Tsirakis, R. Jany, F. Loder, L. F. Kourkoutis, D. A. Muller, J. R. Kirtley, C. W. Schneider, and J. Mannhart, “Interface superconductor with gap behaviour like a high-temperature superconductor,” *Nature (London)* **502**, 528 (2013).
- [20] Guanglei Cheng, Michelle Tomczyk, Sicheng Lu, Joshua P. Veazey, Mengchen Huang, Patrick Irvin, Sangwoo Ryu, Hyungwoo Lee, Chang-Beom Eom, C. Stephen Hellberg, and Jeremy Levy, “Electron pairing without superconductivity,” *Nature (London)* **521**, 196 (2015).
- [21] S. He, J. He, W. Zhang, L. Zhao, D. Liu, X. Liu, D. Mou, Y.-B. Ou, Q.-Y. Wang, Z. Li, L. Wang, Y. Peng, Y. Liu, C. Chen, L. Yu, G. Liu, X. Dong, J. Zhang, C. Chen, Z. Xu, X. Chen, X. Ma, Q. Xue, and X. J. Zhou, “Phase diagram and electronic indication of high-temperature superconductivity at 65 K in single-layer FeSe films,” *Nat. Mater.* **12**, 605 (2013).
- [22] S. Tan, Y. Zhang, M. Xia, Z. Ye, F. Chen, X. Xie, R. Peng, D. Xu, Q. Fan, H. Xu, J. Jiang, T. Zhang, X. Lai, T. Xiang, J. Hu, B. Xie, and D. Feng, “Interface-induced superconductivity and strain-dependent spin density waves in FeSe/SrTiO₃ thin films,” *Nat. Mater.* **12**, 634 (2013).
- [23] J. J. Lee, F. T. Schmitt, R. G. Moore, S. Johnston, Y.-T. Cui, W. Li, M. Yi, Z. K. Liu, M. Hashimoto, Y. Zhang, D. H. Lu, T. P. Devereaux, D.-H. Lee, and Z.-X. Shen, “Interfacial mode coupling as the origin of the enhancement of T_C in FeSe films on SrTiO₃,” *Nature (London)* **515**, 245 (2014).
- [24] H. Unoki and T. Sakudo, “Electron spin resonance of Fe³⁺ in SrTiO₃ with special reference to the 110°K phase transition,” *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **23**, 546 (1967).
- [25] B. Kalisky, E. M. Spanton, H. Noad, J. R. Kirtley, K. C. Nowack, C. Bell, H. K. Sato, M. Hosoda, Y. Xie, Y. Hikita, C. Woltmann, G. Pfanzelt, R. Jany, C. Richter, H. Y. Hwang, J. Mannhart, and K. A. Moler, “Locally enhanced conductivity due to the tetragonal domain structure in LaAlO₃/SrTiO₃ heterointerfaces,” *Nat. Mater.* **12**, 1091 (2013).
- [26] M. Honig, J. A. Sulpizo, J. Drori, A. Joshua, E. Zeldov, and S. Ilani, “Local electrostatic imaging of striped domain order in LaAlO₃/SrTiO₃,” *Nat. Mater.* **12**, 1112 (2013).
- [27] Y. Kozuka, M. Kim, C. Bell, B. G. Kim, Y. Hikita, and H. Y. Hwang, “Two-dimensional normal-state quantum oscillations in a superconducting heterostructure,” *Nature (London)* **462**, 487 (2009).

- [28] Y. Kozuka, M. Kim, H. Ohta, Y. Hikita, C. Bell, and H. Y. Hwang, “Enhancing the electron mobility via delta-doping in SrTiO₃,” *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **97**, 222115 (2010).
- [29] M. Kim, C. Bell, Y. Kozuka, M. Kurita, Y. Hikita, and H. Y. Hwang, “Fermi surface and superconductivity in low-density high-mobility δ -doped SrTiO₃,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 106801 (2011).
- [30] M. Kim, Y. Kozuka, C. Bell, Y. Hikita, and H. Y. Hwang, “Intrinsic spin-orbit coupling in superconducting δ -doped SrTiO₃ heterostructures,” *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 085121 (2012).
- [31] P. G. Björnsson, B. W. Gardner, J. R. Kirtley, and K. A. Moler, “Scanning superconducting quantum interference device microscope in a dilution refrigerator,” *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* **72**, 4153 (2001).
- [32] M. E. Huber, N. C. Koshnick, H. Bluhm, L. J. Archuleta, T. Azua, P. G. Björnsson, B. W. Gardner, S. T. Halloran, E. A. Lucero, and K. A. Moler, “Gradiometric micro-SQUID susceptometer for scanning measurements of mesoscopic samples,” *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* **79**, 053704 (2008).
- [33] J. R. Kirtley, B. Kalisky, J. A. Bert, C. Bell, M. Kim, Y. Hikita, H. Y. Hwang, J. H. Ngai, Y. Segal, F. J. Walker, C. H. Ahn, and K. A. Moler, “Scanning SQUID susceptometry of a paramagnetic superconductor,” *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 224518 (2012).
- [34] J. A. Bert, K. C. Nowack, B. Kalisky, H. Noad, J. R. Kirtley, C. Bell, H. K. Sato, M. Hosoda, Y. Hikita, H. Y. Hwang, and K. A. Moler, “Gate-tuned superfluid density at the superconducting LaAlO₃/SrTiO₃ interface,” *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 060503 (2012).
- [35] Y. Kozuka, Y. Hikita, C. Bell, and H. Y. Hwang, “Dramatic mobility enhancements in doped SrTiO₃ thin films by defect management,” *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **97**, 012107 (2010).
- [36] See Supplemental Material for composite image of susceptibility scans taken at an intermediate temperature. (2016).
- [37] B. C. Larson, Wenge Yang, G. E. Ice, J. D. Budai, and J. Z. Tischler, “Three-dimensional X-ray structural microscopy with submicrometre resolution,” *Nature (London)* **415**, 887–890 (2002).
- [38] G. E. Ice, B. C. Larson, W. Yang, J. D. Budai, J. Z. Tischler, J. W. L. Pang, R. I. Barabash, and W. Liu, “Polychromatic X-ray microdiffraction studies of mesoscale structure and dynamics,” *J. Synchrotron Radiat.* **12**, 155 (2004).

- [39] Gene E. Ice, John D. Budai, and Judy W. L. Pang, “The race to X-ray microbeam and nanobeam science,” *Science* **334**, 1234 (2011).
- [40] T. A. Merz, H. Noad, R. Xu, H. Inoue, W. Liu, Y. Hikita, A. Vailionis, K. A. Moler, and H. Y. Hwang, “Depth resolved domain mapping in tetragonal SrTiO_3 by micro-Laue diffraction,” *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **108**, 182901 (2016).
- [41] E. Sawaguchi, A. Kikuchi, and Y. Kadera, “Microscopic examination of SrTiO_3 at low temperatures,” *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **18**, 459 (1963).
- [42] F. W. Lytle, “X-ray diffractometry of low-temperature phase transformations in strontium titanate,” *J. Appl. Phys.* **35**, 2212 (1964).
- [43] K. A. Müller, W. Berlinger, M. Capizzi, and H. Gränicher, “Monodomain strontium titanate,” *Solid State Commun.* **8**, 549 (1970).
- [44] W. Cao and G. R. Barsch, “Landau-Ginzburg model of interphase boundaries in improper ferroelastic perovskites of D_{4h}^{18} symmetry,” *Phys. Rev. B* **41**, 4334 (1990).
- [45] J. Annett, N. Goldenfeld, and S. R. Renn, “Interpretation of the temperature dependence of the electromagnetic penetration depth in $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{7-\delta}$,” *Phys. Rev. B* **43**, 2778 (1991).
- [46] J. M. Kiat and T. Roisnel, “Rietveld analysis of strontium titanate in the Müller state,” *J. Phys. Condens. Matter* **8**, 3471 (1996).
- [47] T. Sakudo and H. Unoki, “Dielectric properties of SrTiO_3 at low temperatures,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **26**, 851 (1971).
- [48] M. A. Saifi and L. E. Cross, “Dielectric properties of strontium titanate at low temperature,” *Phys. Rev. B* **2**, 677–684 (1970).
- [49] Hisashi Inoue, *Interlayer coupling effects in SrTiO_3 bilayer delta-doped structures*, Master’s thesis, The University of Tokyo (2012), submitted on January 24, 2012.
- [50] P. W. Anderson, “Theory of dirty superconductors,” *J. Phys. Chem. Solids* **11**, 26 (1959).
- [51] D. Fay and J. Appel, “Violation of Anderson’s theorem for superconductors with nonretarded interactions,” *Phys. Rev. B* **51**, 15064 (1995).
- [52] Qian Tao, Bastien Loret, Bin Xu, Xiaojun Yang, Willem Rischau, Xiao Lin, Benoît Fauqué, Matthieu J. Verstraete, and Kamran Behnia, “Non-monotonous anisotropy in charge conduction induced by antiferrodistortive transition in metallic SrTiO_3 ,” (2016), arXiv:1603.03831v1 [cond-mat].

- [53] J. F. Scott, E. K. H. Salje, and M. A. Carpenter, “Domain wall damping and elastic softening in SrTiO_3 : Evidence for polar twin walls,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 187601 (2012).
- [54] H. J. Harsan Ma, S. Scharinger, S. W. Zeng, D. Kohlberger, M. Lange, A. Stöhr, X. Renshaw Wang, T. Venkatesan, R. Kleiner, J. F. Scott, J. M. D. Coey, D. Koelle, and Ariando, “Local electrical imaging of tetragonal domains and field-induced ferroelectric twin walls in conducting SrTiO_3 ,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 257601 (2016).
- [55] A. Ohtomo and H. Y. Hwang, “A high-mobility electron gas at the $\text{LaAlO}_3/\text{SrTiO}_3$ heterointerface,” *Nature (London)* **427**, 423 (2004).
- [56] X. Lin, A. Gourgout, G. Bridoux, F. Jomard, A. Pourret, B. Fauqué, D. Aoki, and K. Behnia, “Multiple nodeless superconducting gaps in optimally doped $\text{SrTi}_{1-x}\text{Nb}_x\text{O}_3$,” *Phys. Rev. B* **90**, 140508(R) (2014).
- [57] I. N. Khlyustikov and A. I. Buzdin, “Twinning-plane superconductivity,” *Adv. Phys.* **36**, 271 (1987).
- [58] B. Kalisky, J. R. Kirtley, J. G. Analytis, Jiun-Haw Chu, A. Vailionis, I. R. Fisher, and K. A. Moler, “Stripes of increased diamagnetic susceptibility in underdoped superconducting $\text{Ba}(\text{Fe}_{1-x}\text{Co}_x)_2\text{As}_2$ single crystals: Evidence for an enhanced superfluid density at twin boundaries,” *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 184513 (2010).
- [59] S. N. Klimin, J. Tempere, J. T. Devreese, and D. van der Marel, “Interface superconductivity in $\text{LaAlO}_3\text{--SrTiO}_3$ heterostructures,” *Phys. Rev. B* **89**, 184514 (2014).
- [60] N. Reyren, S. Thiel, A. D. Caviglia, L. Fitting Kourkoutis, G. Hammerl, C. Richter, C. W. Schneider, T. Kopp, A.-S. Rüetschi, D. Jaccard, M. Gabay, D. A. Muller, J.-M. Triscone, and J. Mannhart, “Superconducting interfaces between insulating oxides,” *Science* **317**, 1196 (2007).
- [61] J.-F. Ge, Z.-L. Liu, C. Liu, C.-L. Gao, D. Qian, Q.-K. Xue, Y. Liu, and J.-F. Jia, “Superconductivity above 100 K in single-layer FeSe films on doped SrTiO_3 ,” *Nat. Mater.* **14**, 285 (2015).
- [62] J. Pearl, “Current distribution in superconducting films carrying quantized fluxoids,” *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **5**, 65 (1964).
- [63] K. C. Nowack, E. M. Spanton, M. Baenninger, M. Koenig, J. R. Kirtley, B. Kalisky, C. Ames, Philipp Leubner, C. Bruene, H. Buhmann, L. W. Molenkamp, D. Goldhaber-Gordon, and K. A. Moler, “Imaging currents in HgTe quantum wells in the quantum spin hall regime,”




FIG. 1. Color. In δ -doped STO, long, narrow regions oriented along cubic $[100]$ and $[010]$ are superconducting at temperatures at which their surroundings are no longer superconducting. (a-c), Maps of magnetic susceptibility in different areas of a single δ -doped sample reveal patterns of superconductivity along $[010]$ (a,b) and $[100]$ (c). Negative susceptibility (in purple and blue) indicates that a region is superconducting. Yellow regions are in the normal state but become superconducting at lower temperatures. Scans were taken at (a) 330 mK, (b) 300 mK, and (c) 320 mK. The schematics of the SQUID pickup loop (red) and field coil (blue) are to scale and are oriented as they were during data acquisition.

Nat. Mater. **12**, 787 (2013).




FIG. 2. Color. Superconducting features change spatially after thermal cycling, indicating that they are most likely due to the cubic-to-tetragonal transition in STO. The same region of a single sample was imaged at 340 mK before (a) and after (b) cycling to room temperature. Distinct features are apparent in (b) in a region that lacked sharp features in (a). The box in (b) indicates the approximate location of the image taken in (a). During sample growth, a clip masked the paramagnetic region in the lower right of the image.




FIG. 3. Color. The spatial variation in susceptibility near T_c is much weaker at lower temperatures. (a) Repeated scans at a single location. (b) Repeated scans at a second location. White lines in (a) and (b) indicate the positions of linecuts displayed in (c) and (d), respectively. (c,d) Averaged linecuts taken at 330 mK and at base temperature (c) or at 330 mK and 100 mK (d) demonstrate that the relative amplitude of modulation of the superconducting response is larger at temperatures near T_c than at the lowest temperatures.




FIG. 4. Color. The temperature dependence of the susceptibility indicates a $\approx 10\%$ spatial variation in T_c . (a) Representative image at 350 mK from a series of images taken in the same area at 15 temperatures. The scan area presented here is different from the ones shown in Figures 1-3. (b) Susceptibility as a function of temperature at two locations marked by a blue diamond and a red triangle in (a). The transition temperatures are ≈ 320 mK and ≈ 360 mK.




FIG. 5. Color. Tilt map of the 1 at.% Nb δ -doped STO reveals domain structure below 105 K. Changes in color indicate changes in the local orientation of the crystal lattice relative to the incident X-ray beam. Red, green, and blue correspond to the x , y , and z components, respectively, of displacements of the c^* reciprocal lattice vector relative to a reference position. The intensity of a particular color reflects the magnitude of the displacement relative to the maximum displacement in that channel in the entire scan area. The scan plane was parallel to the surface of the sample. (a) At room temperature, the lattice is relatively uniform. (b) In contrast, at 80 K, below the cubic-to-tetragonal structural transition, the sample displays features whose orientation and size are consistent with tetragonal domain structure. The white box in (b) indicates the position of the room temperature image in (a). The horizontal feature at the top of (a) and (b) did not change with thermal cycling and is likely due to physical damage to the sample.




FIG. 6. Color. Regions of modulated T_c in 0.2 at.% Nb δ -doped STO. The scans shown in (a) and (b) were taken in different areas of the same sample.




FIG. 7. Color. We detected considerable variation in the widths of the regions that had T_c higher than their surroundings, indicating that at least some of the features are not resolution-limited. (a) Averaged linecuts of the vertical features in (b) and (c). (d) Averaged linecuts of the horizontal features in (e) and (f). The curves in (a) and (d) are offset by intervals of $0.8 \Phi_0/A$ for clarity. Dotted lines indicate zero susceptibility for each curve. The schematics of the SQUID pickup loop (red) and field coil (blue) in (a) and (d) are to scale and are oriented relative to the linecuts as they were during data acquisition. All images were taken at 320 mK and are of the δ -doped sample with 1 at.% Nb doping.




FIG. 8. Allowed orientations of boundaries between tetragonal domains as seen in a cubic (001) plane. Arrows indicate the former cubic [100] and [010] directions. Boundaries between a domain with its tetragonal c axis parallel to the plane and a domain with c axis perpendicular to the plane are at (a) 0° or (b) 90° to the cubic [100] direction. (c) Boundaries between two domains with c axis parallel to the plane are at 45° to the cubic [100] direction.




FIG. 9. Color. A single feature oriented at -45° to the former cubic [100] axis exhibits higher T_c than its surroundings. Repeated scans at a single location on the 1 at.% Nb δ -doped sample at the temperatures indicated on the images.




FIG. 10. Color online. Comparison of superconducting transitions measured in global transport and local susceptibility for the δ -doped sample with $N_D = 1$ at.% Nb and $d = 5.5$ nm shows that zero resistance occurs just below the lower T_c determined from local susceptibility. Resistance as a function of temperature measured in a separate cooldown is shown in black dots; ranges of lower and upper transition temperatures inferred from maps of susceptibility (and reported in Table I) are shown by blue (left) and red (right) vertical bands, respectively. Inset: Resistance as a function of temperature for the two δ -doped samples studied shows that the overall temperature scale for superconductivity in the sample with $N_D = 0.2$ at.%, $d = 36.9$ nm is lower than for the $N_D = 1$ at.% Nb, $d = 5.5$ nm sample.




FIG. 11. Color. Susceptibility images of bulk 1 at.% Nb-doped STO near T_c reveal faint regions of enhanced diamagnetic response oriented along cubic axes. (a,b) Scans in the same area at (a) 325 mK and (b) 335 mK. At 325 mK, the entire image area still is superconducting. The band of faint features in the upper half of (a) is oriented along cubic $[100]$ but does not persist above the bulk T_c of its surroundings.

TABLE I. Estimates of lower and upper T_c and $\Delta T_c/T_c$ for regions of the 1 at.% δ -doped sample displayed in the main text.

Fig.	$T_{c,\text{low}}(mK)$	$T_{c,\text{high}}(mK)$	$\Delta T_c/T_c$ (%)	Scanned area (μm^2)	Notes
1(a)	310	350	13	4.2×10^4	
1(b)	300	340	13	4.2×10^4	Small region remained diamagnetic up to at least 370 mK
1(c)	300	340	13	2.9×10^4	
2(b)	320	380	19	4.4×10^4	Scan area overlapped with region that was masked with clip during growth; small regions remained diamagnetic up to at least 400 mK
3(a)	320	370	16	1.9×10^4	
3(b)	320	350	9	1.9×10^4	Small region remained diamagnetic up to at least 380 mK
4(a)	320	360	13	1.9×10^4	Small region remained diamagnetic up to at least 380 mK